AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The Applicant herein submits an amended set of drawings of Figures 1 – 4 to replace the

originally submitted set of drawings of Figures 1 – 4, in accordance with the Examiner's request.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets, 2 pages

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 have been canceled. Claims 7-14 have been added.

I. Specification

The Applicant submits an amendment to the specification to correct a typographical error in the paragraph beginning on page 3, line 30.

II. Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner stated that the Information Disclosure Statement filed January 28, 2005 failed to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2). The Applicant notes the inadvertent failure to include copies of the noted references and herein submits foreign patent document EP0800329A; a copy of Canadian Publication No. CA2261552, which is a corresponding English translation of German Publication No. DE19906381A; and a copy of non-patent reference Cidon et. al, "Connection Establishment in High Speed Network," August 1, 1993. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider these references and indicate as such by initialing the originally submitted IDS.

III. Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings because a plurality of boxes shown in Figures 1-4 allegedly have no indication as to what the boxes represent. The Applicant therefore submits an amended set of drawings with the requested box labels in Figures 1-4. The Applicant

respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawings in lieu of the amended set.

IV.   Claim Rejections: 35 USC §112, First Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner generally alleged that claims 1-4, directed to a method, and claims 5-6, directed to a server, do not teach one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

Specifically, the Examiner stated that the claimed features of "a set of basic services for using a telecommunications network which, combined with each other, constitute bundles of services" is not described in the specification in such a manner to teach one of ordinary skill in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the invention without undue experimentation.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees, and refers the Examiner generally to the background section of the application beginning on page 1, lines 6 – 16, which discusses the well-known concept of telecommunications providers bundling services in networks. In fact, a technical description is not required, as the concept of bundling services in a network is an organizational concept rather than a technical concept. Therefore, the Applicant submits that the claimed features are described in a manner that one skilled in the art will know how to make and/or use the full scope of the invention without undue experimentation.

The Examiner further stated that the claimed features where "the services of the same group are activated and deactivated during the same transaction" is also not described in the

specification in such a manner to teach one of ordinary skill in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the invention without undue experimentation.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees, and refers the Examiner generally to the paragraph beginning on page 1, lines 24-29, which discusses how a basic service may be inactive because certain network resources are unavailable, such as server being down due to a fault or maintenance operation. Further, one skilled in the art and familiar with telecommunications networks will understand that services provided over the network are activated or deactivated by a server that controls the network. The concept of activating or deactivating services in one transaction does not require a technical explanation, as the broad concept of being able to activate or deactivate multiple services is an organizational concept, not a technical concept, and is well within the understanding of one of ordinary skill in the art.

Finally, the Examiner stated that the Applicant needs to clarify the way to implement a server comprising means for activating (claim 5) and deactivating (claim 6) the basic services in a specific manner to satisfy the limitations of these claims.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The function of a server is well known in the art as "a computer in a network that is used to provide services (as access to files or shared peripherals or the routing of e-mail) to other computers in the network." (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary). The Applicant also refers the Examiner to Figure 4 and the corresponding description on page 5, line 3, where "the activation and deactivation of the basic services are commanded by the SERV." Throughout page 5 of the specification, the server SERV is

described as activating and deactivating services. As the term "server" is well known in the art as a computer in a network that is used to provide services," the Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art will understand how to make and/or use a server configured to activate and deactivate services, as is well described in the specification and laid out in the claims.

The Applicant has also canceled existing claims 1-6 and filed a new set of claims 7-14, to better capture the envisioned commercial embodiment. The Applicant submits that the newly filed claims provide the same explanation and understanding of the elements discussed above, and that the newly filed claims are described in the specification in such a manner to teach one of ordinary skill in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the invention without undue experimentation. For at least the reasons stated above, the Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 USC §112, first paragraph.

V.   Claim Rejections: 35 USC §112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner made numerous comments regarding the grammatical usage in the claims which will not be recited here.

The Applicant herein cancels claims 1-6 and submits new claims 7-14 which address the Examiner's comments. As such, the Applicant submits that the rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, are now moot.

VI.   Claim Rejections: 35 USC §103

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over

Glitho et. al (US Pat. No. 6,199,066) in view of Malik (US Pat. No. 6,188,757). The Applicant

has reviewed the Examiner's comments, but respectfully disagrees.

<u>Claim 1</u>

The Applicant herein cancels claim 1 and submits new claims 7-14 to better capture the

envisioned commercial embodiment. In light of the newly submitted claims, the Applicant

submits that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC §103(a) is moot.

The Applicant also submits that neither Glitho nor Malik teach the feature of "activating

the basic services in the group of basic services during a single transaction, *wherein the basic*

services of the group of basic services can only be activated when all the basic services of the

group can be activated," as stated in newly submitted claim 7. Glitho does not require that all of

the basic services in a group be activated in order to activate the basic services.

<u>Claim 2</u>

The Applicant herein cancels claim 2 and submits new claims 7-14 to better capture the

envisioned commercial embodiment. In light of the newly submitted claims, the Applicant

submits that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 USC §103(a) is moot.

The Applicant also submits that neither Glitho nor Malik teach the feature of deactivating

the basic services in a group of basic services when one of the basic services in the group of

basic services is unavailable. Malik discloses the feature of deactivating temporary advanced telecommunications features, but it does not disclose that those features are deactivated in response to the unavailability of one of the features. In contrast, one aspect of the invention, as set forth in the newly submitted claims, discloses deactivating the basic services in a group of basic services when one of the basic services in the group of basic services becomes unavailable. Therefore, neither Glitho nor Malik, taken alone or in combination, disclose the invention as set forth in the claims.

Claims 3 and 4

The Examiner rejected claims 3 and 4 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Glitho et. al (US Pat. No. 6,199,066) in view of Malik (US Pat. No. 6,188,757) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Low et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0073210). The Applicant has reviewed the Examiner's comments, but respectfully disagrees.

The Applicant herein cancels claims 3 and 4 and submits new claims 7-14. In light of the newly submitted claims, the Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 3 and 4 under 35 USC §103(a) is moot.

Furthermore, the combination of Glitho, Malik, and Low does not disclose the invention as set forth in the newly submitted claims, with respect to the use of a group identifier assigned to each basic service. Low, in contrast, discusses a *session* identifier that identifies a *communication* session to be used in the future; the communication session identifier having a temporal meaning to classify the timing of events, not to classify a service to distinguish the

service as belong to a group or groups. The Applicant submits that it would not be obvious for

one of ordinary skill in the art to modify a classification system for a communication system, as

described in Low, with the teachings of Glitho or Malik to arrive at the present invention. The

Applicant further does not believe that Low, either alone or in combination with Glitho or Malik,

teaches a classification system where a service is classified by the group of services the service is

in. As such, the Applicant believes the rejection under 35 USC §103(a) should be withdrawn.

<u>Claims 5 and 6</u>

The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over

Glitho et. al (US Pat. No. 6,199,066) in view of Malik (US Pat. No. 6,188,757) as applied to

claim 1 above, and further in view of Nightingale et al. (US Pat. No. 6,061,729). The Applicant

has reviewed the Examiner's comments, but respectfully disagrees.

The Applicant herein cancels claims 5 and 6 and submits new claims 7-14. In light of the

newly submitted claims, the Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 5 and 6 under 35 USC

§103(a) is moot.

Furthermore, the Applicant submits that the server of Nightingale does not teach the

server as described in the newly submitted claims, as the server in Nightingale does not provide

for the activation and deactivation of basic services in a group of basic services. In lieu of the

arguments presented above regarding the failure of Glitho and Malik to teach the other elements

of the invention, the Applicant also believes that the Glitho, Malik and Nightingale, taken alone

or in combination, do not teach the elements of the claimed invention. As such, the Applicant

requests that the Examiner withdraw the 35 USC §103(a) rejection.

VII.   Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott H. Davison/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC   Scott H. Davison
Telephone: (619) 238-3545   Registration No. 52,800
Facsimile: (619) 238-4931

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 27, 2007